



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,999	02/10/2004	Sadeg M. Faris		9093
26665	7590	04/08/2008		
REVEO, INC.			EXAMINER	
6 Skyline Drive			TRAN, BINH X	
Hawthorne, NY 10523				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/775,999	FARIS, SADEG M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Binh X. Tran	1792	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 and 21-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 7-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of Group II (claims 7-20) in the reply filed on 01-31-2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. Claims 1-6, 21-35 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 01-31-2008.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 8-9 of page 10, the applicants recites "the weak bond regions 3 are easily released form the substrate, as schematically shown in Figure 5, for example with handle 150" (emphasis added). First the term "form" appears to be a typo for --from--. Second, Figure 5 does not exist (only Figure 5A or Figure 5b exist). Third, both Figure 5A and Figure 5b do not show the weak bond region 3 or the handle 150 as stated by applicants.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Double Patenting

5. Applicant is advised that should claim 8 be found allowable, claim 12 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In claim 18, the examiner does not understand limitation "removing the device layer by debonding the strong bond and minimally or not at all debonding the weak bond areas" (emphasis added). If the weak bond areas are not at all debonding, then device layer still bonded the substrate at the areas of weak bonding. It is not possible to remove the device layer (bonded to the substrate) if weak bonding areas exist and they are bonds to the substrate. In order to remove the device layer, all bonding areas (strong and weak) must be debonded.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 7-17, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In line 2 of claim 7, “the wells” (emphasis added) lack antecedent basis. The applicants recite “providing a well” (i.e. singular). However, the applicants later refer as “the wells” (i.e. plural).

In line 9 of claim 7, “the stack of device layers” lack antecedent basis. Applicants do not disclose “device layers” prior reciting the limitation “the stack of device layers” in line 9.

In line 2 of claim 9, “grinding, polishing or otherwise removing material from the cut edge” is vague and indefinite. It is unclear from the claim what specific “material” that applicants wish to remove from the cut edge since the cut edge comprises plurality of material.

Claim 12 recites the limitation “the nozzle opening” in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 16 recites the limitation “the nozzle opening” in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 8-16 are indefinite because they directly or indirectly depend on indefinite claim 7.

In line 10 of claim 17, "the stack of device layers" lack antecedent basis.

Applicants do not disclose "device layers" prior reciting the limitation "the stack of device layers" in line 10.

In line 12 of claim 17, the phrase "etching from the cut edges" (emphasis added, plural) lacks antecedent basis. The applicants recite "expose a cut edge" (singular) in line 11. However, the applicants later refer as "the cut edges" (i.e. plural).

In line 2 of claim 19, "the wells" (emphasis added) lack antecedent basis. The applicants recite "providing a well" (i.e. singular). However, the applicants later refer as "the wells" (i.e. plural).

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the layer" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claim 7, 17, 19, 20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

10. Claims 8-16 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The cited prior arts fail to disclose or suggest the step of etching from the cut edge at least a portion of the etch removable layer at the plateau to create a nozzle tip in combination with all other limitation in the claims.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Notice of Reference Cited, Form PTO-892.
13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh X. Tran whose telephone number is (571)272-1469. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Binh X Tran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1792

/Binh X Tran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792

Application/Control Number: 10/775,999
Art Unit: 1792

Page 7